



RESEARCH ARTICLE

INFLUENCE OF DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES ON THE PERFORMANCE OF ACADEMIC STAFF: A STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN A PROVINCE OF INDIA

Dr. A. Ravichandran¹ and Dr. Sonali Ahuja Dua²

1. Associate Professor Department of Commerce Satyawati College Evening(University of Delhi) Delhi.
2. Associate Professor Department of Commerce Gargi College(University of Delhi) Delhi.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 24 May 2022

Final Accepted: 28 June 2022

Published: July 2022

Key words:-

Demographic Attributes Age, Gender, Education, Promotion, Teaching Experience, Performance, Publication, Professional Development Activities, Research and Guidance and Academic Workforce

Abstract

Purpose: The performance of employee is determined by several factors such as their motivation, commitment, development, satisfaction level in their job, positive work climate and so on. One of the important factors which would determine the performance of an employee is their demographic attributes such as age, gender, education, family status, promotion, length of service, designation, etc. and these factors are inherent in each employee. Demographic attributes are acknowledged to have a deep impact on the performance level of the employee in any organization. Based on this theoretical consideration, this paper is an attempt to investigate the influence of demographic attributes of the academic staff on the level of their performance.

Methodology: Demographic attributes are measured by age, gender, educational qualification, experience and promotion and performance by research and development activities of the academic workforce. A stratified random sampling technique was applied for data collection and the study was conducted in Liberal Arts and Science Colleges in Tamil Nadu Province (India). A total of 656 academic workforces were responded from all four regions (East, West, North, and South). The statistical tools of Frequency distribution, Independent T-test and one-way ANOVA with Post hoc test were applied to test the significant variation, if any, between demographic variables and the performance level of the academic workforce.

Findings: The results clearly show that demographic attributes of Age, Educational Qualification, Promotion and Length of Teaching Experience have significantly influenced the level of performance of the academic workforce. However, results indicate that gender of the respondent has not significantly influenced their performance level and both male and female academic workforce equally performed well.

Implication: The results of this study contribute to theoretical support about the influence of demographic factors of academic staff on the level of their performance. It also supports empirically the proposed hypotheses that contribute to understanding the influence of personal and professional variables of academic staff and their performance. Further, the influence of personal and professional variables on the

Corresponding Author:- Dr. A. Ravichandran

Address:- Associate Professor Department of Commerce Satyawati College Evening(University of Delhi) Delhi- India.

level of performance confirmed or negated propositions that existed in the review of the literature.

Originality/Value: There is a lack of research work in the Indian higher education sector which establish the influence of demographic attributes on the performance level of the academic workforce and this study fills this gap. Understanding the influence of personal and professional attributes of academic staff on the level of their performance would enable the educational administrators to formulate appropriate composition of academic staff and imply in the HR planning and recruitment strategy and also in other HR policies to attract and retain the highly qualified and experienced academic workforce.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2022,. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

The role and contribution of an employee is a prime indicator to achieving the goals of any organization, particularly in the present knowledge work environment and it is only possible through an effective and efficient performance of employees which in turn defines the rise or fall of the organization. The performance of the employee is determined by several factors such as their commitment, development, satisfaction level in their job, positive work climate and so on. One of the important factors which would also determine the performance of the employee is their personal and professional attributes such as age, gender, education, family status, promotion, length of service, designation, etc. and these factors are inherent in each employee. Demographic attributes are acknowledged to have a deep impact on the performance level of the employee in any organization and they are independent variables by definition and cannot be changed. George (2010) defined demographic attributes as the personal characteristics of an employee and it consists of age, gender, education, income, ethnicity, race and family size, the average size of family, the average age at marriage, job experience, promotion, etc. Employee performance on the other hand is crucial for the performance of the organization to achieve its goals in an ever-changing work environment. Warr (1994) defined job performance as the effectiveness of job behaviour of employees in real work settings and it is normally measured after completion of the task assigned. The performance of an employee at work is the outcome of both situational factors and dispositional variables. Thus, it is essential to ensure that employers recruit the right kind of people and must always foster and develop the potential of its human resources as they are an extremely valuable asset of the organization. "If an employee of the organization is properly motivated and guided, even an ordinary employee could also produce extraordinary results" (Ravichandran, 2021).

Several research studies in the past examined and identified that personal and professional or job-related attributes have a significant influence on the performance of employees (Adler, 2005; Hedge and Borman, 2009; Ramilo, 2004; Shrum, 2007; Nazrul, 2009; and SuharniRahayu, 2017). This paper seeks to examine the influence of personal and professional attributes on the performance of academic staff in higher educational institutions to be more specific Liberal and Science Colleges. The performance of higher educational institutions largely depends upon the quality, commitment and personal and professional attributes of its academic workforce. These institutions turn out an employable workforce in a country and therefore their performance is positively correlated with the workforce quality.

Literature Review:-

Age and Employee Performance

There is a growing awareness about the ageing of employees and its relative importance to employee performance. Many researchers have observed 'Age' as having a very pertinent role in determining whether an employee will be able to perform as per the requirements of the job or not. Age is one factor that influences both performance and promotion of employees. Adler (2005) on the effects of demographic recruitment policies on employee performance discovered that demographic factors can improve job performance. Recruiting from a wider range of ages and ethnicity gives the firm a larger talent pool. While some studies prove that performance decreases with age, some other studies prove that even though workability seems to be decreasing with age, job performance is found to be more stable (Salthouse& Maurer 1996). Andoh, Biako and Afranie (2011) pointed out that the idea of age is looked at from different points of view by different people. Those who are old age may have an accumulation of experience and knowledge hence a contributory

factor to the ability to perform better. On the contrary, some relate old age to wearing out, tiredness, increased family and other social responsibilities and vulnerability to diseases which are contributory factors to low work performance. There are some notable psychological differences between older and younger people. Hedge and Borman (2009) argued that employers can take advantage of the ageing workforce by paying attention to their needs that are related to ageing and capitalizing on their strengths such as experience and innovation. This Age of employees has an impact on their performance. At the beginning of the career, an employee is more energetic but lacks experience. In the later years, an employee lacks physical strength and sometimes even medical concerns set in and these might pose as a limitation on employees' performance in some cases. The impact of age on performance also depends on the nature of the job. A person in the older age group might not be able to do as much work which requires physical effort as a person in the younger age group might.

Research conducted by Yi, Ching's age was categorized into three categories namely, young, middle and old. These three categories have the same pattern in achieving promotion because of the demands of the organization where the employees work. Some studies indicate that the performance decline starts earlier in physically strenuous jobs than in mentally demanding jobs (Ilmarinen 1999; Capanni et al. 2005). Sports people retire at an early age. The simple reason behind this is that sports are physically demanding and after crossing 35 years of age it is difficult to keep up with the physical demands of the profession. It is a common observation that the body of a person in the 70s is not as strong as the body of an individual in his 30s. 70-year-old people have poorer eyesight than most 30-year-olds (Margrain&Boulton, 2005).

Gender and Employee Performance

Gender seems to play a significant role in employees' job motivation and job performance. It is believed that the gender of an individual affects his or her performance and as such human resource managers should have the same consideration when assigning duties and when looking at employee performance. There are different schools of thought on this subject. Some strongly believe that gender does have an impact on performance whereas others believe that in the present times when both men and women are taking different roles than the traditional roles such views are not relevant. Ramilo (2004); Shrum (2007) and Nazrul (2009) are of the view that the gender of employees tends to significantly affect their job motivation and job performance in the workplace and they argue that men are more disposed to work harder than women. According to Jackson (2009), there are many stereotypes in existence concerning the difference in abilities between men and women in many organizations. Therefore, they point out the possibility of having stereotypically driven performance results at the time of appraisal. Andoh, Biako and Afranie (2011) stated the importance of recognizing the fact that there are only a few gender-related differences that will affect the performance of men and women. It is observed that while women are good at obeying rules and following instructions, men are more aggressive and aim at seeing the results quickly. The differences are however minor and might not be universally adopted as an explanation as to why men and women attain different performance standards (Murray, 2002). Burleson and Samter (1992) examined and found that gender is a significant determinant of performance in the workplace. They emphasize that a particular gender tends to perform better in a certain profession and academic courses than the other gender. If this is the case, the implication could be that gender has a significant correlation with job performance. Nowadays men and women are treated equally in all areas of life (Moore, 1990) and organizations are no exception men and women are competing for the same job position. This is because in the globalization of business all individuals are given equal opportunities to work in the organizations. Hence, it is necessary to know whether all individuals can work and compete at the same rate irrespective of their age and gender. If their performance levels are known to be the same, then they could be treated alike in the organization especially concerning the financial benefits. There are notable differences between men and women both physical and psychological. These differences might give rise to the way men and women function at work. For example, an average woman may not be able to work at the same efficiency level as an average man in a physical task. A study indicated that men and women are psychologically different (Goleman, 1995). Modern management studies also predict that emotional intelligence plays a significant role in employee performance (Goleman, 1995). Although many studies have indicated that there are notable differences between male and female employees (Brush, 1992), some have proved that there are no differences in the productivity of men and women (Ahl, 2002). The argument for the latter is because modern studies are of the view that a person's gender (masculinity or femininity) is based on differences in social experiences (Bem, 1993; Korabik, 1999) and sex may not completely determine a person's gender (Fischer et al., 1993).

Modern studies indicate that there is a gender convergence, rather than divergence, and that women and men nowadays are far more alike than they were some decades ago (Kimmel, 2000). This is because even from childhood males and females are treated alike in all walks of life and society is not discriminating between them.

Modern society has erased the boundaries between the lifestyles of both sexes. Moore (1990) distinguishes between "traditional (i.e., female with traditional values, adhering to stereotypical female work roles) and modern (i.e. present generation females who are similar to, than different from their male counterpart). Up to the early 1990s, research on female entrepreneurship identified gender differences concerning individual characteristics. Brush (1992) examined and identified that women business owners are different from men in terms of individual-level characteristics such as education, occupational experience, motivations, and circumstances of business start-up/acquisition. However, contemporary research indicates that for a range of individual characteristics (including psychological, attitudinal and personal background factors) there are more similarities than differences between female and male entrepreneurs (Ahl, 2002). He identified that the scarce research (usual studies with few observations) focusing upon organization refers to a distinctive management style of female entrepreneurs as compared to that of male entrepreneurs. (Ahl, 2002) argues that "The female underperformance hypothesis did not hold when put to rigorous tests accounting for structural factors" and if preferences are taken into account there appears to be no support for the proposed gender differences in entrepreneurial performance. Consequently, a study (Ahl, 2002) indicated that females are the "engine of economic growth". Bloom (2003) argued that as compared to men, women in western countries have a better chance of succeeding in business due to their better performance. Some studies reported no difference between males and females in performance in the examinations of medical students (Holmes et al., 1978). In contrast to these, others found that female students outperformed males on both clinical evaluations and written examinations (Plauché and Miller, 1986).

Inmyxai and Takahashi (2010) conducted a study to examine and compare the performance contrast of male and female-headed firms. This research examined and identified that differences exist between male and female-headed firms in terms of determinant factors of firm performance. The study (FauzilahSalleh et al, 2012) concluded that there are no significant differences between sales performance and business traders' gender. But this study is contrary to the studies (by Orser and Foster (1992); Heck et al (1995) and Coleman (2000)) carried out to identify gender differences in the performance of annual sales and profits and it found that there were significant differences on the performance of small industry run by men and women. Similarly, studies (Coleman, 2000; Minoo and Charles, 2003) indicated that gender has a significant impact on the performance of micro- businesses. However, the study of Minoo and Charles (2003) on the gender differences in small business ownership gave ambiguous results. According to Hyde (1981) and William and Bedward (2001), there are no consistent male-female differences in problem-solving ability, analytical skills, competitive drive, motivation, sociability, or learning ability.

Education Qualifications and Employee Performance

Education attainment refers to the type of academic credentials or degrees an individual has obtained. The level of education is a continuous variable but is frequently captured as a categorical measure in empirical studies (Akinwunmi and Adeyanju, 2011). In the present context, education is taking the central stage in employment and an individual is considered eligible for a job only when the individual fulfils a certain set of minimum educational requirements as laid by the employer. Easterlin (2007) states that the skills gained through education are a mark of performance. Education is a priceless asset of fundamental value to the individual and society. It provides a sound basis for individuals to develop their potential (Akinwunmi and Adeyanju 2011). Cushway (2003) observes that in modern times, individuals may be used productively disregarding their original qualifications when they were employed. This implies that the potential of an individual is far more than the educational qualifications that the person has obtained. This is realized when an employee has worked in the organization for some time and has been able to show his potential in other areas besides the one that he had been recruited for. Stanley (2017) defines education as a factor that influences employee promotion. Higher knowledge and intellectuality of an employee increase the chances of a better position of the individual in the organization. In the present dynamic environment, it is essential to keep oneself updated and enhance one's skills. In the present Covid-19 pandemic situation teaching which was earlier being done in the physical space is now being conducted in the virtual space. For education to continue the academic staff had to upgrade themselves with the new techniques of online teaching. The organizations have to give due attention to academic training mainly because of two reasons. First, non-specialized workforces make more mistakes and errors such actions negatively impact the productivity of the worker and hence low employee performance (Griffin and Moorehead, 2011). Secondly, when a job is reassigned to untrained employees, their motivation level decreases quickly and there is a possibility of a steep decline in the level of job performance (Griffin, 2011). The pace for the social, economic or political development of a nation depends on the quality of the human resource of the nation. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to enhance the levels of

understanding besides education and skills. Thus, it can be concluded that educational qualifications have a significant impact on employee performance.

Promotion and Employee Performance

Job promotion not only shows the dynamics of the job but also other aspects that are given in line with the job description and therefore promotions are generally in the interest of the employees. According to Ardanaet and GedePurnawanAdiet. al., (2016) there are basics in job promotions including seniority, job performance, loyalty level and honesty. Sikula(2000) states that promotion within an organisation is the movement of an employee from one position to another which involves a higher status and responsibility. Usually, a move to a higher position includes an increase in salary and other benefits. Research conducted by WindaYulyartaSimanjuntak (2015) and SuharniRahayu (2017) found that job promotion has a positive and significant influence on employee performance. Virginia MaulidiahSeptiani (2015) found that job promotion influences performance level of employee.

Work Experience and Employee Performance

Work experience is perhaps one of the most commonly encountered concepts in personnel research and practice. It is more relevant for many human resource functions such as selection (Ash & Levine, 1985), training (Ford, Quinones, Sego, & Sorra, 1992) and career development (Campion, Cheraskin& Stevens, 1994; McCall, Lombardo and Morrison, 1988). Given the importance of work experience for human resource practice and research, it is not surprising that a fair amount of research has examined the concept and its relationship with important outcomes such as job performance, productivity, quality of service, etc. The number of years that individuals work for an organization could influence their job performance as they would have gained knowledge about the job. In addition to gaining work experience, many years of work within the same organization establish good interpersonal relations and employee is sustainable. It also reflects that individual plays a crucial role in achieving organizational goals (Yeatts&Hyten, 1998). According to Yeatts and Hyten (1998) tenure is descriptive of the direct employer-employee interface a background which may affect the way an employee performs. It is observed that employees who stay long in an organization are more satisfied with the job and their stay in the organization and those who exit the organization are dissatisfied and are hopeful of getting better places that can satisfy their employment needs.

Research Gap

Several studies have been conducted on the impact of personal and professional variables on employee performance in different sectors in different countries. After reviewing several research studies in the past, it came to light that there is immense scope for research on the effect of demographic factors on the performance of the academic workforce in the Indian higher education sector. Based on this theoretical consideration, the present paper seeks to examine the influence of demographic factors on the performance of the academic workforce.

Significance Of the Study

In the recent past, the quality and overall performance of Indian Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) are often under-scrutinized and it has become an emergent issue. It seems that very few Indian HEIs are flashed among the top 100 universities in the world though India is the 3rd largest higher educational network (in number) in the world after US and China. The main object of any HEI is to enhance its academic standard and higher ranking at the international level and for which the performance of the academic workforce including their teaching and research and development activities plays a very significant role. The performance of the academic workforce determines several factors as stated in an earlier paragraph and one of the important determinant factors is the demographic characteristics of the academic workforce. Thus, it needs to study and understand the influence of demographic (to be more specific personal and professional) variables and their performance. The findings of this study would enable the policy makers in formulating policies for evaluating the performance of employees working in the HEI as it would add the demographic and professional attributes as factors under consideration in performance management. The study would also help in reducing the gap that exists in the measurement of employee performance under the influence of demographic and professional variables in HEIs in India as the review of the existing literature unveils a wide gap in the studies that are available about this issue.

Methodology: -**Objectives of the Study**

To Study and examine the personal and professional attributes of academic staff in the Liberal Arts and Science Colleges;

To analyse and find out the level of performance of academic staff in the Liberal Arts and Science Colleges; and

To study and understand the influence of Personal and Professional attributes of academic staff on their Performance.

Hypotheses

1. Age does not have a significant influence on the Job Performance.
2. There is no significant variation between Gender and Job Performance.
3. Educational qualification is likely to be significantly influenced the Job Performance
4. Promotion is likely to have a significant influence on the level of Job Performance.
5. Teaching experience is likely to have a significant influence on the Job Performance.

Variables and its measurement

The present study comprises and focuses on two sets of concepts and their related attributes i.e., demographic (to be more specific personal and professional) variables and Performance of the academic workforce. The personal factors taken into account in this study are: Age and Gender and Professional factors are: Educational Qualification; Promotion; and Length of Teaching Experience. Age has been defined as "an individual respondent faculty member's development measured in terms of years" and it has been categorized as: less than 30 years (Young); 30 to 45 years (Middle-aged); and above 45 years (Older). Gender has been defined as the physical difference between the respondent faculty members and it has been classified in this study as male and female academic workforce. Under the Professional attributes, it has been classified and included: i) Educational Qualification (Post Graduate (PG), M.Phil and PhD); ii) Promotion which is defined as the number of Promotions or higher academic rank obtained by the respondent faculty members in the current institute and which has been categorized as Nil, one, two, and more than two; and iii) Teaching Experience which is defined as the total number of years worked and gained in the current employing institute and it has been categorized as less than 10 years; 10 to 20 years; and more than 20 years. The other important aspect of this study is the Performance of the academic workforce. Existing research studies suggest that the Performance of the academic workforce could be measured in terms of teaching, research and development activities and extension/community service. In this study research and development activities of the academic workforce are considered as Performance because there was a lack of research studies found on this aspect. It has been defined as the job behaviour of the academic workforce while conducting research and development activities and has been measured as Publications (Books, book chapters, articles in magazines/newspapers, conference papers within and outside India, and research articles in peer-reviewed or refereed or UGC care list); Professional Development Activities (PDA) which includes (participating/organizing seminar/conference/workshop/faculty development programs, delivering invited lectures as keynote speaker/chief guest in any academic forums and membership in professional bodies); and Research and Guidance (R & G) and it is defined as the involvement in undertaking sponsored research projects, guiding for research scholars and adjudicating PhD theses as an Indian examiner. It is measured and included in three items in the questionnaire as number of research projects undertaken and completed, number of guidance and awarded M. Phil/PhD scholars, and number of PhD theses adjudicated as an Indian examiner.

Sampling, Data Collection and Statistical Tools

The sample institutes are higher educational institutions (Arts and Science Colleges) from the province of Tamil Nadu (India) and this state is geographically divided into four regions i.e., East, West, North and South. The researchers tried to ensure balanced data collection from all four regions. To ensure uniformity in the sample selection and to have balanced data collection the following three criteria have been adopted: The first criteria is only those colleges which are approved by Tamil Nadu Province (verified through www.tndce.in) were selected as sample institute; The second criteria is that sample College should have complied with "mandatory disclosure" in its website with full details of faculty profile including their contact details of email address and contact number for an easy approach to respondent faculty members, and the third criteria is those institutes which have completed 30 years and more from the date of its establishment assuming that older institutes would have more research and development activities with accommodating academic workforce from all respect of demographic factors. Based on the above stratified random technique 7 sample institutes from each region have been selected (7X4=28 institutes) and 30 questionnaires were mailed to each select sample institute. A total of 696 responses have been received and

of which 40 responses were found incomplete and the remaining 656 were taken into consideration for data analysis purpose. To obtain a fair and adequate representation the researchers have distributed the questionnaire based on the personal and professional profile of the respondent faculty member. The data was collected through both offline (print version) and online (Google forms) mode according to the convenience of the respondent. The data pertains to Demographic variables and the Performance of the academic workforce was coded in a master table using IBM SPSS version 20 and the data analysis was done through quantitative technique. Descriptive statistics of frequency distribution were applied (Table 1) to ascertain the percentage of respondent faculty members from select demographic and professional factors. Independent T-test and One Way ANOVA with Post Hoc test was applied to analyze the significant difference, if any, between demographic and professional attributes and the Performance level of the academic workforce. The Performance of academic staff was measured by five-point Likert-scale using 5= highly performed to 1=less performance. It is understood that a range of mean score value out of five was used for more meaningful interpretation but easy understanding, it slightly modified the five-point Likert scale into three stages i.e., average score level of Performance was described as 1-2.49 to be interpreted as "less Performance", 2.5-3.49 to be "moderate Performance level" and 3.5-5 to be higher Performance (Kassaw&Gola, 2019).

Results And Discussion:-

Frequency Distribution of respondent academic staff

Table 1 provides the frequency distribution of respondent faculty members from the survey. The frequency distribution table indicates that there is well represented in middle-aged respondents (30-45 years; 58%), a fair representation in older age (above 45 years; 34%) and a low representation in young faculty (less than 30 years of age; 8%) respondent.

Table 1:- Frequency distribution.

Demographic Variables		No. Observation	Percentage
Age	Less than 30	54	8
	30-45	382	58
	Above 45	220	34
	Total	656	100.0
Gender	Male	392	60
	Female	264	40
	Total	656	100.0
Education	PG	23	4
	M.Phil.	160	24
	Ph.D	473	72
	Total	656	100.0
Present Exp.	Less than 10 years	289	44
	10-20 years	247	38
	Above 20 years	120	18
	Total	656	100.0
Promotion	NIL	376	57
	One	146	23
	Two	87	13
	More than two	47	7
	Total	656	100.0

It is possible to say that these HEIs are employing more middle-aged and older academic staff than young. It is observed that there is fair representation from both male (60%) and female (40%) respondent academic staff. The majority of the faculty members possess PhD research degree qualification (72%) followed by M. Phil (24%) and only a minimum representation (4%) from Post Graduate qualification. It could say that HEIs in this Province can attract higher research degree qualification than mere Post Graduate and M. Phil degrees. Concerning teaching experience, there are moderate

responses from both less than 10 years (44%) and 10-20 years (38%) of experience and only minimum representation from above 20 years of experience (18%). It is possible to understand that these HEIs are not able to either attract and or retained well-experienced academic staff and it could be either internal factors or better opportunities from other institutes. Academic staff who have not obtained even a single Promotion represented well (57%) and minimum representation from both 1(23%) and 2 (13%) promoted respondents. There is a meagre representation from more than 2 Promotion obtained (7%) respondents. It could understand that academic staff in these HEIs are not been timely promoted due to various reasons such as financial implications, delays in the process of Promotion etc.

Comparison between Personal Attributes and Performance

Table 2 and 3 provides data analysis for comparison between Personal profile and Performance of academic staff. The detailed interpretation from the results is given below.

Age and Performance

The data analysis indicates that there is significant difference between overall age group and all the Performance dimensions as $p < .05$. However, there is variation within the group of age categories i.e., there is no significant difference between young and middle aged in Publication and overall Performance ($p > .05$) and significant difference in Professional Development Activities and Research and Guidance ($p < .05$). Further there is a strong and significant difference between young and older staff in all the dimensions of Performance ($p < .05$) and older staffs are comparatively well performed than young except in Professional Development Activities where young staffs are better (Mean=4.05) than older (Mean=3.77). Concerning to middle aged and older there is significant difference ($p < .05$) in all the dimensions of Performance except in Professional Development Activities where there is no significant difference ($p > .05$) and reveals older staffs are performed higher level in all dimensions (Mean value is greater than 3.5 in all the dimensions) and middle-aged staffs are at moderate level. It could understand from this analysis that age of the respondent is significantly influenced on the level of Performance and also that young staffs are shown much interest to involve themselves in Professional Development Activities such as conducting/participating seminar/workshop/conference and so on.

Personal Variables	Category of variables	Performance Variables											
		Publication			Professional Development Activities			Research and Guidance			Overall Performance		
		Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.
Age	Young	3.25			4.05			3.25			3.52		
	Middle aged	3.36			3.67			3.48			3.50		
	Older	3.78			3.77			3.84			3.80		
	Total	3.46	36.71	.000	3.73	6.59	.001	3.59	30.09	.000	3.60	30.44	.000
Gender	Male	3.53			3.70			3.61			3.61		
	Female	3.44			3.78			3.56			3.59		
	Total	3.49	1.71	.087	3.74	1.45	.148	3.59	.93	.354	3.60	.45	.652
E.QLN	PG	3.08			4.04			3.27			3.46		
	M.Phil.,	3.19			3.68			3.35			3.41		
	Ph.D	3.61			3.73			3.68			3.68		
	Total	3.29	32.10	.000	3.82	2.28	.103	3.43	18.77	.000	3.52	21.11	.000
Promotion	Nil	3.34			3.66			3.50			3.50		
	One	3.50			3.71			3.54			3.58		
	Two	3.90			3.94			3.82			3.89		
	More than two	3.87			3.95			4.02			3.95		
	Total	3.49	25.90	.000	3.73	4.64	.003	3.59	13.24	.000	3.60	27.06	.000
Exp.	less experienced	3.34			3.70			3.44			3.50		
	Moderate experienced	3.47			3.66			3.56			3.56		
	Highly experienced	3.90			3.96			3.99			3.95		
	Total	3.49	34.07	.000	3.73	7.07	.001	3.59	30.89	.000	3.60	44.98	.000

Table 2: - One Way ANOVA/'T' test for comparison between Demographic variables and Performance.

*'t' value would be applicable for Gender only and 'F' value for remaining variables: E.QLN= Educational Qualification; GS= Gross Salary per month; Exp. = Teaching Experience

Table 3:- Post Hoc test for comparison between personal and Performance variables.

Personal Variables			Performance Variables							
			Publication		PDA		R & G		Overall Performance	
Variables	(I) Category	(J) Group Comp.	M.D. (I-J)	Sig.	M.D. (I-J)	Sig.	M.D. (I-J)	Sig.	M.D. (I-J)	Sig.
Age	Young	Middle	-.11049	.440	.38137*	.001	-.22835*	.038	.01418	.975
		Older	-.53276*	.000	.27471*	.042	-.58969*	.000	-.28258*	.000
	Middle Aged	Young	.11049	.440	-.38137*	.001	.22835*	.038	-.01418	.975
		Older	-.42227*	.000	-.10667	.213	-.36133*	.000	-.29676*	.000
	Older	Young	.53276*	.000	-.27471*	.042	.58969*	.000	.28258*	.000
		Middle	.42227*	.000	.10667	.213	.36133*	.000	.29676*	.000
E.QLN.	P.G	M.Phil	-.11424	.691	.35910	.083	-.07357	.868	.05710	.845
		PhD	-.53400*	.000	.31039	.132	-.41008*	.009	-.21123	.084
	M.Phil	P.G.	.11424	.691	-.35910	.083	.07357	.868	-.05710	.845
		PhD	-.41976*	.000	-.04871	.760	-.33651*	.000	-.26833*	.000
	PhD	P.G.	.53400*	.000	-.31039	.132	.41008*	.009	.21123	.084
		M.Phil	.41976*	.000	.04871	.760	.33651*	.000	.26833*	.000
Promotion	Nil	One	-.16102*	.040	-.04810	.913	-.03928	.926	-.08280	.237
		Two	-.56036*	.000	-.27543*	.011	-.32229*	.000	-.38603*	.000
		More than two	-.52926*	.000	-.28790	.063	-.51928*	.000	-.44548*	.000
	Minimum Promotion (One)	Nil	.16102*	.040	.04810	.913	.03928	.926	.08280	.237
		Two	-.39934*	.000	-.22733	.114	-.28301*	.007	-.30322*	.000
		More than two	-.36823*	.002	-.23980	.225	-.48000*	.000	-.36268*	.000
	Moderate Promotion (Two)	Nil	.56036*	.000	.27543*	.011	.32229*	.000	.38603*	.000
		One	.39934*	.000	.22733	.114	.28301*	.007	.30322*	.000
		More than two	.03111	.993	-.01247	1.000	-.19699	.338	-.05945	.886
	Highly Promoted (More than two)	Nil	.52926*	.000	.28790	.063	.51928*	.000	.44548*	.000
		One	.36823*	.002	.23980	.225	.48000*	.000	.36268*	.000
		Two	-.03111	.993	.01247	1.000	.19699	.338	.05945	.886
Exp.	Minimum experience (Less than 10 years)	10-20 years	-.12765*	.048	.04467	.770	-.11479	.097	-.06592	.207
		Above 20 years	-.55716*	.000	-.25886*	.004	-.54251*	.000	-.45284*	.000
	Moderate experience (10-20 years)	Less than 10 years	.12765*	.048	-.04467	.770	.11479	.097	.06592	.207
		Above 20 years	-.42951*	.000	-.30353*	.001	-.42772*	.000	-.38692*	.000
	Highly experienced (Above 20 years)	Less than 10 years	.55716*	.000	.25886*	.004	.54251*	.000	.45284*	.000
		10-20 years	.42951*	.000	.30353*	.001	.42772*	.000	.38692*	.000

E.QLN= Educational Qualification; P.G.= Post Graduate; M.Phil=Master of Philosophy; G.S.=Gross Salary p.m.; Exp.= Teaching Experience; M.D.= Mean Difference; PDA=Professional Development Activities; R&G= Research and Guidance

It could also be argued that the age and Performance of the employee largely depend on the nature of work. For instance, those tasks which require more involvement of physical nature may be performed better in the younger age period and those which require more expertise, experience, application of knowledge and professionalism may perform better in the older age period of work life. The results of this study prove that older academic staff performed better than younger staff as professionalism, expertise, sound knowledge, and competence are more important than physical involvement in the academic profession. The data analysis confirms that Hedge and Borman (2009); Andoh, Biako and Afranie (2011); Heck et al. (1995); Orser and Foster (1992); and Abdulrahamon, Adeleye, and Adeola (2018) were older employees performed better than younger and contradiction with that of Hedge and Borman (2012) where younger employees performed better than older.

H1: Age does not have a significant influence on Performance. The findings of this study indicate that age has a significant influence on the Performance of academic staff and therefore this hypothesis is rejected.

Gender and Performance

The data analysis reveals that there is no significant difference between males and females in all the dimensions of Performance ($p > .05$). Though there is no statistical difference that male academic staff performs well better than female staff. (Kotur and Anbazhagan, 2014) argued that notable differences between men and women both physical and psychological too. They argued that average women may not be able to work with the same efficiency level as an average man in the physical work task as men are physically stronger than women. But it need not necessarily be in those tasks which require more expertise, experience, application of knowledge and professionalism where women could perform better than men and vice-versa and even both could perform equally well. The finding of this data analysis is consistent with that of BiriandIwu (2014) where there was no significant difference between gender and Performance of broadcast employees and contradiction with that of Abdulrahamon, Adeleye, and Adeola (2018) where gender was significantly influenced on the Performance level of accountants.

H2: There is no significant variation between Gender and Job Performance: This proposition is accepted as there is no significant difference in the job performance between male and female academic staff.

Comparison between Professional Attributes and Performance

Educational Qualification and Performance

The data analysis (table 2) indicates that there is a significant difference between academic qualification and overall Performance of academic staff $p < .05$. However, there is variation in the Performance level while comparing within the category of educational qualification. The Post Hoc test indicates that there is no significant difference between Post Graduate and M. Phil qualifications in all the dimensions of Performance. It is also found that there is no significant difference between Post Graduate and PhD qualifications in Professional Development Activities and Overall Performance. The Performance of academic staff with PhD qualification is higher than that of Post Graduate and M. Phil degree qualification except in Professional Development Activities where academic staff with mere Post Graduate degree performed well than that of the other two categories. Studies in the past reported that higher academic qualification was strongly related to task completion, an important contributor to the completion of every job at the right time and also improves the overall job Performance (Kuneel et al. 2004; Karatepe, Undudag, Menevis, Hadzimehmeddagic, and Baddar, 2006; Maglen, 1990; and Ng and Feldman, 2009). The findings from this data analysis partially confirmed the above studies as there is a higher level of Performance in the Professional Development Activities by Post Graduate academic qualification than M. Phil and PhD holders of academic staff. It could understand that employees with higher academic qualifications do not mean always have the expertise and may find sometimes lower Performance due to a lack of practical/technical skills and expertise. However, irrespective of the arguments many agree that employee job Performance is highly tied to academic qualifications (Green 2012).

H3: Educational qualification is likely to be significantly influenced on job Performance. This proposition is partially accepted as there is no significant difference between academic qualification and Performance of Professional Development Activities.

Promotion and Performance

The results (table 2) show that there is a significant difference between the Promotion group and all the dimensions of Performance ($p < .05$). However, the Post Hoc multiple comparison test (table 3) indicates that there is variation within the group of Promotion categories. For instance, there is no significant difference in all the factors of

Performance (except publication) between those academic staffs whose Promotion is nil and promoted at a "minimum level". Similarly, there is no significant difference in all the factors of Performance level between "moderate and highly promoted academic staffs and also found that there is no significant difference in Professional Development Activities between all the categories of Promotion. Except for these variations, there is a strong and significant difference in the factors of Performance between all the categories of Promotion. Further, the results indicate that the Performance level of "moderate" and "highly promoted" academic staff is greater (Mean score is greater than 3.5) than the other two categories. It is important to state that Promotion has a significant influence on the level of Performance to some extent. It could say that Promotion will enhance the status, pay grade and responsibilities of the employee and it could be treated as a kind of strategy or motivation or a mechanism to enhance the Performance of employees in any organization. The findings of this study are confirmed with that of (Rahayu and Suharni, 2017; Yamin, Sakawati and Putri, 2019; Rinny, Purba, and Handiman, 2020) where Promotion was strong and positively correlated with the performance level of employees of the organization.

H4: Promotion is likely to have a significant influence on the level of Performance. This proposition is also partially accepted as some dimensions of promotion have significantly influenced and some have not significantly influenced the performance level.

Job experience and Performance

Similar to Promotion the results of one-way ANOVA show that there is a significant difference between the level of teaching experience group and all the dimensions of job Performance ($p < .05$). However, Post Hoc multiple comparison tests (table 3) indicate that there is no significant difference in Performance between faculty members having less experience (less than 10 years) and moderate experience (10-20 years) faculty members' Performance in all the dimensions. The Performance level of both less and moderate experience categories is significantly different from highly experienced (More than 20 years) faculty members. Further, highly experienced faculty members perform better followed by the moderate experienced category. It is possible to understand from the data analysis that faculty with more work experience will perform better than moderate and less experienced because the more experienced employee could have gained sound knowledge, expertise, application of more professionalism and maturity, strong decision-making ability, and so on. The result of this analysis is consistent with that of Yilmaz (2015); Bhargava and Anbazhagan, (2014); Andrew, (2009); Sturman, (2001); and Ehrenberg & Smith, (2000) where the job experience was significantly influenced on the performance level of employee.

H5: Teaching experience is likely to have significant influence on job Performance: This hypothesis is accepted as the results indicate that the work experience of the faculty members is strongly influenced on their level of Performance.

Summary and Conclusion: -

The results of this study contribute to theoretical support about the influence of demographic factors of academic staff on the level of their Performance. It also supports empirically the proposed hypotheses that contribute to understanding the influence of Personal and Professional variables of academic staff and their Performance. Further, the influence of Personal and Professional variables on the level of Performance confirmed or negated propositions existing in the review of the literature. Understanding the influence of personal and professional attributes of academic staff on the level of Performance may enable the educational administrators to formulate appropriate composition of academic staff and imply in the HR planning and recruitment strategy and also in other HR policies to attract and retain the highly qualified and experienced academic workforce. This is because the results of this study indicate that the highly qualified, seniors (older), professionally well experienced and higher job positioned (Promotion) academic staff performed better than the younger, less qualified, less experienced and lower job positioned. The teaching quality and other outcomes may also be positively impacted by employing more seniors, older, highly qualified, experienced and academic ranked workforce. Deployment of academic staff for assigning additional or higher responsibilities leading to enhanced job Performance should be based on age, academic qualifications, professional experience and academic ranks. Overall, the results of the study indicate that except for gender the demographic variables of the academic staff significantly influenced their Performance level.

Limitations Of the Study

The present study considered only limited demographic variables i.e., age, gender, educational qualification, promotion and job experience due to limited resources and other constraints though there were several other variables (such as marital status, race, family structure, income, etc.) found in the existing research studies. The

Performance of the faculty members has been limited to research and development activities and not covered the teaching performance and extension service. The present research study is also restricted to liberal arts and science HEIs and other HEIs such as engineering, medicine, law, etc. have not been included. It is, therefore, generalization from these findings to the overall performance of the academic staff and also overall higher education sector at the national level needs to be kept in perspective.

References:-

1. Abdulrahamon, I.A., Adeleye, S.T., and Adeola, T.F. (2018), "Impact of Educational, Professional Qualification and Years of Experience on Accountant Job Performance". *Journal of Accounting and Financial Management*, 4(1):32-44.
2. Adi, I GedePurnawan, IWayanBagia, daWayanCipta. (2016), "PengaruhPromosiJabatanDanDisiplinKerjaterhadapKinerjaPegawai". e-JournalBismaUniversitasPendidikanGanesha. Vol 4.
3. Adler, M. G., &Fagley, N. S. (2005), *Appreciation: Individual Differences in Finding Value and Meaning as a Unique Predictor of Subjective Well-Being*. *Journal of Personality*, 73(1), 79–114.
4. Ahl, H.J. (2002), "The making of the female entrepreneur, A discourse analysis of research texts on women's entrepreneurship", JIBS Dissertation Series 015, Jönköping University
5. Akinwumi, F. S. &Adeyanju, H. I. (2011), "A post training job performance of sandwich and full-time certificate in education. Graduates in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Pakistan journal of social sciences*, 8(2): 94-99.
6. Andoh, Biako and Afranie (2011), A study on the relationships between age, work experience, cognition, and work ability in older employees working in heavy industry; *Journal of Physical Therapy*. Vol 27(1).
7. Andrew, J. D. (2009), "Leadership: Research findings, Practice and skills 5 Ed, Houghton Mufilin co., Boston, USA.
8. Ash, R.A. & Levine, E.L. (1985). Job applicant training and work experience evaluation: An empirical comparison of four methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 70. 572-576.
9. Bem, S. L., (1993), *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. Yale University Press.
10. Biri, E.U. and Iwu, C.G. (2014), "Job Motivation, Job Performance and Gender Relations in the Broadcast Sector in Nigeria". *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(16): 191-197.
11. Bhargava, R.K. and Anbazhagan, S. (2014), "Education and Work-experience-Influence on the performance". *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5):2319-7668.
12. Bloom D.E., Canning D., Sevilla J.(2003), "The Demographic Dividend A New Perspective on the Economic Consequences of Population Change, A RAND Program of Policy-Relevant Research Communication.
13. Borman, W. R. &Mehay, S. L. (2009), Graduate education and employee performance: evidence. *Economics of Education Review*, 453–463.
14. Brush, C.G. (1992), "Research on women business owners: past trends, a new perspective and future directions", *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 16 (4).
15. Burleson, B. R., &Samter, W. (1992). Are there gender differences in the relationship between academic performance and social behavior? *Human Communication Research*, 19(1), 155–175.
16. Campion, M.A., Cheraskin, L., & Stevens, M.J. (1994), Career-related antecedents and outcomes of job rotation. *Academy of Management Journal*. 37. 1518-1542.
17. Capanni, C., Sartori, S., Carpentiero, G. & Costa, G. (2005), "Work ability index in a cohort of railway construction workers", *International Congress Series*1280: 253257 Clerkship". *Journal of Medical Education*, Vol. 61, 323-325.
18. Coleman, S. (2000), "Access to capital and terms of credit: A comparison of men and women owned small businesses", *Journal of Small Business Management*, 38(3): 37-52.
19. Cushway, B.(2003), *The Handbook of Model Job Description*. London: Kogan page Publishers.
20. Ehrenberg, R. G. & Smith, R. S. *Modern labour economics: Theory and public policy*, Reading, MA: Addison Wesley. 2000
21. FauzilahSalleh et al., (2012), "Demographic Characteristics Differences and Sales Performance among Night Market Traders".
22. Fischer, E.M., Reuber, A.R. and L.S. Dyke, (1993), "A theoretical overview and extension of research on sex, gender and entrepreneurship". *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8 (2).
23. Flipo (2018) Flippo, Edwin B (1984) *Personnel Management (Sixth Edition)*, McGraw- Hill Book Company, New York.

24. Ford, J.K., Quinones, M.A., Sego, D.J., & Sorra, J. (1992). Factors affecting the opportunity to perform trained tasks on the job. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 511-527.
25. George, A. (2010), "Demographic Variables and Self-efficacy as Factors Influencing Career Commitment of Librarians in Federal University Libraries in Nigeria". Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
26. Goleman, D. (1995): *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
27. Griffin, R. W., Moorehead, & Gregory., (2011) *Organizational Behavior*. New York: Cengage Learning.
28. Heck, R., Rowe, B., & Owen, A. (1995). *Home Based Employment and Family Life*. Westport, Connecticut: Auburn House.
29. Hedge, J.W.(2009).*The Oxford Handbook of Work and Aging*. London: Oxford University Press.
30. Holmes FF., Holmes GE., Hassanien R. , Performance of male and female medical students in a medicine Clerkship, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 239, 2259-2262.
31. Hyde, (1981), "How large are cognitive gender differences?" *American Psychologist*, pp. 892-901.
32. Ilmarinen, J. (1999), "Ageing Workers in the European Union Status and Promotion of Work Ability", *Employability and Employment*. Helsinki: Finnish Institute of Occupational Health in Malaysia", *International Business Research*, Vol. 5(4), doi:10.5539/ibr.v5n4p25
33. Inmyxai, S., & Takahashi, Y., (2010). "The effect of firm resources on business performance of male- and female-headed firms in IOSR *Journal of Business and Management*.
34. Jackson, C., (2009) *Gender into poverty won't go*. The International Handbook of Gender and Poverty: concepts, research, and policy Edward Elgar: UK, 47-52.
35. Karatepe, O.M., Ududag, O., Menevis, I., Hadzimehmeddagic, L. and Baddar, L. (2006). The effects of individual characteristics on frontline employee performance and job satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 27, 547-560.
36. Kassaw, E.S. and Golga, D.N., "Employees' Organizational Commitment in Higher Educational Setting". **Preprints** 2019, 2019040 029 (doi: 10.209 44/ preprints 201904. 0029.v2).
37. Kimmel, M.S., (2000) *The Gendered Society*, Oxford University Press.
38. Korabik, K., (1999), *Sex and gender in the new millennium*, in: G.N Powell (ed.), *Handbook of Gender and Work*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
39. KoturandAnbazhagan(2014), "Influence of Age and Gender on the Performance". *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5): 97-103.
40. Kuneel, N.R., Hezlett, S.A. and Ones, D.S. (2004). "Academic performance, career potential creativity and Job performance. Can one construct predict them all?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.86: 148-161.
41. Magden, L.R. (1990). Challenging the human capital orthodoxy: The education-productivity link re-examined. *The Economic Record*, 66, 281-294.
42. Margrain, T. H. & Boulton, M., (2005). "Sensory impairment In M. Johnson (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Age and Ageing*".
43. McCall, M.W., Lombardo, M.M., & Morrison, A.M. (1988). *The lessons of experience*.
44. Minoo, T., & Charles, S. (2003). *Economic development and micro-enterprises in rural communities: Are there gender differences?*
45. Moore, D.P. (1990), "An examination of present research on the female entrepreneur-suggested research strategies for the 1990s", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9 (4-5): 275-281.
46. Murray, S. L., Rose, P., Bellavia, G., Holmes, J., & Kusche, A. (2002). When rejection stings: How self-esteem constrains relationship- enhancement processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 556-573.
47. Murray, S. L., Rose, P., Bellavia, G., Holmes, J., & Kusche, A. (2002), "When rejection stings: How self-esteem constrains relationship- enhancement processes". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 556-573.
48. Nazrul, J.K.K. (2009). *Use of ICTS in gender equalization*. USTC Teachers Annual (USTA-2010). New York: Lexington.
49. Ng, T.W.H. & Feldman, D.C. (2009), "How broadly does education contribute to job Performance?" *Personnel Psychology*, 62: 89-134. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008. 01130.x
50. Orser, B., & Foster, M. (1992). *Home Enterprise: Canadians and Home-Based Work*. The Home-Based Business Project Committee, Canada.
51. Plauché, W. C. and J. M. Miller J. M., (1986), "Performances of Female Medical Students in an Obstetrics and Gynaecology".

52. Rahayu, Suharni. (2017). "Pengaruh Promosi Jabatan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Garuda Metalindo". *Journal KREATIF: Pemasaran, Sumber Daya Manusia dan Keuangan*. Vol.5. No.1. ISSN 2339 – 0689. Hal 59-75.
53. Ramilo, C.G., (2004). Gender evaluation methodology for ICT initiatives. Online: <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Project/5348/>. Accessed Ap.
54. Ravichandran, A. (2021), "Impact of HRD Climate on Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study of Liberal Arts and Science Colleges in Tamil Nadu Province (India)". *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 23(8):18-27.
55. Rinny, P., Purba C.B., Handiman U. T. (2020), "The Influence Of Compensation, Job Promotion, And Job Satisfaction On Employee Performance Of Mercubuana University". *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management* 5(2), 39-48.
56. Salthouse, T. & Maurer, T. J., (1996). "Aging, job performance, and career development. In J. E. Birren & K. W. Schaie (eds.), *Handbook of the Psychology of Aging*, Edition 4th, 353-364. Scientific Research, 2(2), 31-41
57. Septiani, Virginia Maulidiah. (2015). "Pengaruh Pelatihan, Pengalaman Kerja, dan Promosi Jabatan terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Sulawesi Utara". *Jurnal EMBA: Journal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis, dan Akuntansi*. Vol.3. No.3. ISSN 2303-11. Hal 992-1002.
58. Shrum. L. J. (2007). The implications of survey method for measuring cultivation effects. *Human Communication Research*, 33(1), 64-80.
59. Sikula, A. (2000). Personnel administration and human resources management. *Journal of basic Applied*.
60. Simanjuntak, Winda Yulyarta. (2015). "Pengaruh Promosi Jabatan terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada PT. Riau Media Grafika/Tribun Pekanbaru". *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*. Vol.2. No.2. Hal 1-12.
61. Stanley, J., Robboy, M., D., Roger., M., (2017) Structural Annual Faculty Review Program Accelerates Professional Development and Promotion: Long Term Experience of The Duke University Medical Centers Pathology Department. *Academic Pathology Journal*. Vol 4, 1-19.
62. Sturman, M. C. (2001). Time and performance: A three-part study examining the relationships of job experience, organizational tenure, and age with job performance (CAHRS Working Paper #01-05). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labour Relations, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies. <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrswp/68>. (2nd ed.), Vol. 1: 171-221. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press. 1990.
63. Thakur G., (2015), "The influence of demographic characteristics on performance of academic employees in Kenyatta University. Mercubuana University". *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management* 5(2), 39-48.
64. Warr, P., (1994). Age and job performance. In J. Snel & R. R. Cremer (eds.), *Work and Aging. A European Perspective* (309322). London: Taylor & Francis.
65. Williams A & Bedward J. (2001), "Gender, Culture and Generation Gap: Student and Teacher Perceptions of Aspects of National Curriculum Physical Education Sport, Education and Society, 1, 53-66.
66. Yamin, M.N., Sakawati, H., and Putri, N.Q. (2019), "Position Promotion and Employee Performance in the regional Secretariat of Makassar City". *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, 9(2):327-334.
67. Yeatts, D. E., & Hyten, C. C. (1998), "High-performing self-managed work teams: A comparison of theory to practice". Sage Publications, Inc.
68. Yi-Ching Chen, M., Shui Wang, Y., dan Sun, V. (2012). Intellectual capital and organizational commitment. *Personnel Review*, 41(3), 321–339.
69. Yilmaz, O. D (2015), "Revisiting the Impact of Perceived Empowerment on Job Performance: Results from Front-Line Employees". *Tourizam*, 19 (1) 34-46.